

EXHIBIT B

Spelman, Kate T.

From: p.guionnet@tcs.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 12:18 PM
To: philippe guionnet; Robben, Philip; purplefeng@outlook.com; r.gopinathan@tcs.com; supakash.mukhopadhyay@tcs.com; ajoy.mukherjee@tcs.com; s.narasimhan@tcs.com; s.kant@tcs.com; satya.hegde@tcs.com; alexejun@quarles.com; mbyroade@kelleydrye.com; Caslin, Brent; dlong@kelleydrye.com; bneider@staffordlaw.com; kgn@quarles.com; Saros, Nick; mjahn@quarles.com; Spelman, Kate T.; aat@quarles.com; mvergeront@staffordlaw.com; abecker@kelleydrye.com
Subject: Re: Epic V. TCS - case 14-CV-748

From: philippe guionnet [pguionnet@msn.com]
Sent: 01/06/2015 12:16 PM PST
To: "Robben, Philip" <probben@kelleydrye.com>; "purplefeng@outlook.com" <purplefeng@outlook.com>; P Guionnet; R Gopinathan; Supakash Mukhopadhyay; Ajoy Mukherjee; S Narasimhan; S Kant; Satya Hegde; philippe guionnet <pguionnet@msn.com>; "alexejun@quarles.com" <alexejun@quarles.com>; "mbyroade@kelleydrye.com" <mbyroade@kelleydrye.com>; "bcaslin@jenner.com" <bcaslin@jenner.com>; "dlong@kelleydrye.com" <dlong@kelleydrye.com>; "bneider@staffordlaw.com" <bneider@staffordlaw.com>; "kgn@quarles.com" <kgn@quarles.com>; "nsaros@jenner.com" <nsaros@jenner.com>; "mjahn@quarles.com" <mjahn@quarles.com>; "kspelman@jenner.com" <kspelman@jenner.com>; "aat@quarles.com" <aat@quarles.com>; "mvergeront@staffordlaw.com" <mvergeront@staffordlaw.com>; "abecker@kelleydrye.com" <abecker@kelleydrye.com>
Subject: RE: Epic V. TCS - case 14-CV-748

TCS,

1) I was contacted this morning by your external attorney, even though I had specified yesterday that I did not want you to contact me through outside attorneys.

2) Mr. Robben is requesting that I direct all further communications to either Ms. Byroade or to him alone (versus directly to TCS I suppose).

I am not a lawyer so I do not know for sure but the Subpoena clearly states "may serve on the party or attorney designated".

I intend to serve on the party (TCS), please substantiate if you think my legal obligation is different.

In the meantime, I will do both.

3) I do not wish to enter into a dialogue with your external attorney, unless you can clearly state my legal obligation to do so.

4) I do not intend to dialogue on what the Subpoena was or was not supposed to represent, especially after the fact; I doubt a firm of their caliber and reputation would have issued a Subpoena so negligently, at Christmas, enough to omit "clarifications" so important;

Besides, it does not significantly change the subject of searching through thousands of documents, Communication and Information.

I believe I may have hundreds (maybe thousand) of documents related to the EPIC matter.

I am hereby renewing my request of Quashing or Modifying the Subpoena; I am requesting the Court to validate the new document and not TCS/its attorneys alone; again I am not a lawyer so please be specific if you think I cannot request the Court to validate.

5) Regarding my intent to contact Epic counsel, what I indicated clearly was copying them ONLY on the 2 emails I sent Yesterday, with the mention "Outside Counsel Eyes Only"; 1 document is titled "written objection to Subpoena-request for

Quashing or Modifying", the other one "written objection (continued)";
I did NOT indicate that I would communicate other documents I have in my possession.

6) Again, I am not a lawyer, so I might get confused with the Legal vocabulary;
To avoid confusion, please be specific, itemize what you think I am not allowed to send, and in front of each section indicate "you are not allowed to send this...because".

7) if you think I am not legally permitted to send to Epic counsel the 2 emails I sent Yesterday, with the mention "Outside Counsel Eyes Only", 1 document titled "written objection to Subpoena-request for Quashing or Modifying", the other one "written objection (continued)", please make it clear (i.e. "your are not allowed...because").

8) If you think I am not legally permitted to comment, including to Epic Counsel "Outside Counsel Eyes Only", about Court documents (public) where my name is associated (implied, insinuated, etc.) and/or related (per your definition) to derogatory terms, misrepresentation, untrue comments and that are damaging to me, please be specific ! (i.e. "you are not allowed...because").

9) If you think I am not allowed to comment, and/or send those 2 emails "Outside Counsel Eyes Only", in the context of Whistleblowers policies, in particular but not only, set forth in California Code SB 496 (and SB 666 and AB263), similar in other states and Federal, in particular but not only to "party or group of interest", please be specific (i.e. you are not allowed to..."); in reference to the same laws, it is my understanding that some TCS documents are not protected under the rules you mentioned, please be specific if this is not true.

10) I am not aware of what the Judge ruled regarding documents, please send me a copy.
Be specific if you think the Judge ruling includes my 2 emails.

Also, please provide appropriate contact information for the Court and/or Judge so I can make direct contact.
I have a legitimate belief that your information and request is malicious, with intend to mislead the Court.
in particular but not only, some comments that are now public are causing me irreparable damages and I want to inquire with the Court if/how I can reverse them;

- For example, I was the Client Partner on the Kaiser Account until May 2014!
it is NOT TRUE that I was transitioned of my responsibilities in 2013;

- For example, I was a star employee, with exceptional performances, recognized and awarded as such for my yearly review as recently as APRIL 2014!
It is NOT TRUE that since 2013, I occupied my time essentially being a "professional whistleblower", I was clearly, without doubt and recognized by others, the Client Partner on the Kaiser Account.

- For example, It is **NOT TRUE** and a gross misrepresentation that my job responsibility had nothing to do with MedMantra;

Also, comments about lack of compliance with California Whistleblower policy, other States or Federal do not fall under this ruling and I should be able to comment; let me know if I am mistaken

11) TCS (and its attorneys when required) should contact me on my TCS email address; **DO NOT** contact me on my personal email address

12) I am copying Epic attorneys on this email, "Outside Counsel Eyes Only";

Please clarify no later than MIDNIGHT (EST) tonight (9 pm PST).

Regards